# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI SOUTHEASTERN DIVISION

SYLVESTER EVERETT HAHN,	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
v.	)	No. 1:08-CV-169 LMB
MISSOURI DEPARTMENT OF	)	
CORRECTIONS, et al.,	)	
Defendants.	)	

## MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

This matter is before the Court on the motion of Sylvester Hahn (registration no. 1052376), an inmate at Moberly Correctional Center, for leave to commence this action without payment of the required filing fee. For the reasons stated below, the Court finds that plaintiff does not have sufficient funds to pay the entire filing fee and will assess an initial partial filing fee of \$51.80. See 28 U.S.C. \$ 1915(b)(1). Upon initial review of the complaint, the Court finds that it fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. However, the Court will allow plaintiff to file an amended complaint within 30 days of the date of this Order.

## 28 U.S.C. § 1915(b)(1)

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(b)(1), a prisoner bringing a civil action in forma pauperis is required to pay the full amount of the filing fee. If the prisoner has insufficient funds in his or her prison account to pay the entire fee, the Court must assess and, when funds exist, collect an initial partial filing fee of 20 percent of the greater of (1) the average monthly deposits in the prisoner's account, or (2) the average monthly balance in the prisoner's account for the prior six-month period. After payment of the initial partial filing fee, the prisoner is required to make monthly payments of

20 percent of the preceding month's income credited to the prisoner's account. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(b)(2). The agency having custody of the prisoner will forward these monthly payments to the Clerk of Court each time the amount in the prisoner's account exceeds \$10, until the filing fee is fully paid. <u>Id.</u>

Plaintiff has submitted an affidavit and a certified copy of his prison account statement for the six-month period immediately preceding the submission of his complaint. A review of plaintiff's account indicates an average monthly deposit of \$259.00, and an average monthly balance of \$224.71. Plaintiff has insufficient funds to pay the entire filing fee. Accordingly, the Court will assess an initial partial filing fee of \$51.80, which is 20 percent of plaintiff's average monthly deposit.

## 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B), the Court may dismiss a complaint filed in forma pauperis if the action is frivolous, malicious, fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, or seeks monetary relief against a defendant who is immune from such relief. An action is frivolous if "it lacks an arguable basis in either law or in fact." Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 328 (1989). An action fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted if it does not plead "enough facts to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face." Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, 127 S. Ct. 1955, 1974 (2007).

In reviewing a pro se complaint under § 1915(e)(2)(B), the Court must give the complaint the benefit of a liberal construction. <u>Haines v. Kerner</u>, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972). The Court must also weigh all factual allegations in favor of the plaintiff, unless the facts alleged are clearly baseless. Denton v. Hernandez, 504 U.S. 25, 32-33 (1992); Scheuer v. Rhodes, 416 U.S. 232, 236 (1974).

## The Complaint

Plaintiff brings this action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Named as defendants are the Missouri Department of Corrections, Larry Crawford (Director, Missouri Department of Corrections), David Penrod (Correctional Officer), Ryan Hillis (same), Brad Troutt (same), Jonathan Rice (same), Jeffrey Parks (same), and Harvey Cannoles (same). Plaintiff seeks monetary relief.

At all times relevant to the complaint, plaintiff was a prisoner at Southeast Correctional Center. Plaintiff alleges that on March 31, 2004, he was asleep in his cell when two other inmates entered his cell and stabbed him several times. Plaintiff claims that the other inmates also tied him up with shoestrings and beat him severely. Plaintiff says the assault lasted approximately one hour. Plaintiff claims to have suffered several severe injuries as a result of the assault.

Plaintiff alleges that immediately after the other inmates left his cell he rang the emergency button. Plaintiff says that he did not receive any medical attention for forty-five minutes to an hour later. Plaintiff claims that he "begged for help [but] none of the Defendants lifted a hand to help [him]."

### **Discussion**

As to the Missouri Department of Corrections, the complaint fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. See e.g., Barket, Levy & Fine, Inc. v. St. Louis Thermal Energy Corp., 948 F.2d 1084, 1086 (8th Cir. 1991) (agency exercising state power is not "person" subject to § 1983 suit).

The complaint is silent as to whether the individual defendants are being sued in their official or individual capacities. Where a "complaint is silent about the capacity in which [plaintiff] is suing defendant, [a district court must] interpret the complaint as including only official-capacity claims."

Egerdahl v. Hibbing Community College, 72 F.3d 615, 619 (8th Cir. 1995); Nix v. Norman, 879 F.2d 429, 431 (8th Cir. 1989). Naming a government official in his or her official capacity is the equivalent of naming the government entity that employs the official, in this case the State of Missouri. Will v. Michigan Dep't of State Police, 491 U.S. 58, 71 (1989). "[N]either a State nor its officials acting in their official capacity are 'persons' under § 1983." Id. As a result, the complaint fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted as to each of the individual defendants.

"Liability under § 1983 requires a causal link to, and direct responsibility for, the alleged deprivation of rights." Madewell v. Roberts, 909 F.2d 1203, 1208 (8th Cir. 1990); see also Martin v. Sargent, 780 F.2d 1334, 1338 (8th Cir. 1985) (claim not cognizable under § 1983 where plaintiff fails to allege that defendant was personally involved in or directly responsible for the incidents that injured plaintiff); Boyd v. Knox, 47 F.3d 966, 968 (8th Cir. 1995) (respondeat superior theory inapplicable in § 1983 suits). In the instant action, plaintiff only refers to "defendants" in a vague manner and has not set forth any specific facts indicating that each individual defendant was directly involved in or personally responsible for the alleged violations of his constitutional rights. As a result, the complaint fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted.

Because the complaint fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, it is subject to summary dismissal under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e). However, because plaintiff is pro se, and because the allegations in the complaint are quite serious, the Court will allow plaintiff an opportunity to file an amended complaint. Plaintiff shall have 30 days from the date of this Order to file an amended complaint. Plaintiff is warned that the filing of an amended complaint replaces the original complaint, and claims that are not realleged are deemed abandoned. See, e.g., In re Wireless Telephone Federal

Cost Recovery Fees Litig., 396 F.3d 922, 928 (8th Cir. 2005). If plaintiff fails to file an amended

complaint within 30 days, the Court will dismiss this action without prejudice.

Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's motion to proceed in forma pauperis is

**GRANTED**. [Doc. 2]

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the plaintiff shall pay an initial filing fee of \$51.80 within

thirty (30) days of the date of this Order. Plaintiff is instructed to make his remittance payable to

"Clerk, United States District Court," and to include upon it: (1) his name; (2) his prison registration

number; (3) the case number; and (4) that the remittance is for an original proceeding.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk shall not issue process or cause process to issue

upon the complaint at this time.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that plaintiff shall file an amended complaint no later than 30

days from the date of this Order.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that if plaintiff fails to comply with this Order, the Court will

dismiss this action without prejudice.

CHARLES A. SHAW

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated this 12th day of December, 2008.

5